UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P O Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www uspto gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/813,035	03/31/2004	Sachio Kizu	250588US2SRD CONT	3816

22850 7590 01/23/2009
OBLON, SPIVAK, MCCLELLAND MAIER & NEUSTADT, P.C.
1940 DUKE STREET
ALEXANDRIA, VA 22314

EXAMINER	
SCOTT, RANDY A	
ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2453	

NOTIFICATION DATE	DELIVERY MODE
01/23/2009	ELECTRONIC

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

patentdocket@oblon.com
oblonpat@oblon.com
jgardner@oblon.com

Office Action Summary	**Application No.** 10/813,035	**Applicant(s)** KIZU ET AL.	
	Examiner RANDY SCOTT	**Art Unit** 2453	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE _3_ MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on _31 March 2004_.

2a)☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b)☒ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) _22-51_ is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) _22-51_ is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a)☒ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)

2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)

3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date _3/31/04_.

4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ .

5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application

6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

1. This Office Action is responsive to the application filed 3/31/2004

Claim Rejections – 35 USC 103

2. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office Action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained through the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

3. Claims 22, 23, 24, 25, 29, 31, 32, 33, 34, 38, 40, 41, 42, 43, 47, 49, 50, and 51 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Koval et al (US 5,333,299) in view of Kainulainen et al (US 6,262,996).

With respect to claims 22, 31, 40, 49, 50, and 51, Koval teaches a receiver configured to receive, from a master device for a data synchronization group, a certificate indicating that the slave device belongs to a data synchronization group to which the master device belongs (see col. 10, lines 2-10 & 15-22, which teaches a "sync group" that allows the slave in sync with the master node to be paired in the same synchronization group upon notification), a certification unit configured to determine, when a synchronization request from another device is received, whether or not the another device and the slave device belong to the same data synchronization group by using the certificate stored in the memory (see col. 10, lines 10-25, which teaches grouping slave streams), and a synchronization unit configured to perform data synchronization between the another device and the slave device based on the priority stored in the memory when

the certification unit determines that the another device and the slave device belong to the same data synchronization group (see col. 10, lines 10-25, which teaches grouping of slave streams).

Koval et al teaches all the limitations of claims 22, 31, 40, 49, 50, and 51, except for a priority to be used for solving conflict of data, thereby registering the slave device as a member of the data synchronization group to which the master device belongs and performing data synchronization between the first slave device and the second slave device based on the priority if the first slave device and a memory configured to store the received certificate and priority.

The general concept of a priority to be used for solving conflict of data, thereby registering the slave device as a member of the data synchronization group to which the master device belongs and performing data synchronization between the first slave device (see Kainulainen et al col. 9, lines 40-45, which teaches synchronization based on a priority list), the second slave device based on the priority (see Kainulainen et al col. 9, lines 38-45, which teaches that each of the plurality of nodes has independent synchronization capabilities that is done based off of highest signal priority), and a memory configured to store the received certificate and priority (see Kainulainen et al col. 8, lines 34-39, which teaches memory to store the synchronization priority information) is well known in the art as illustrated by Kainulainen et al.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to combine Koval et al with the general concept of wherein the information requested comprises at least one hardware characteristic of each of said one or more network workstations, as illustrated by Kainulainen et al, in order to effectively implement a server-free sync system.

With respect to claims 23, 32, 33, 41, and 42, Koval et al teaches a receiver configured to receive, from a master device for a data synchronization group, a certificate indicating that the slave device belongs to a data synchronization group to which the master device belongs (see Koval et al, col. 10, lines 2-10 & 15-22, which teaches a “sync group” that allows the slave in sync with the master node to be paired in the same synchronization group upon notification), a certification unit configured to determine, when a synchronization request from another device is received, whether or not the another device and the slave device belong to the same data synchronization group by using the certificate stored in the memory (see Koval et al, col. 10, lines 10-25, which teaches grouping slave streams), and a synchronization unit configured to perform data synchronization between the another device and the slave device based on the priority stored in the memory when the certification unit determines that the another device and the slave device belong to the same data synchronization group (see Koval et al, col. 10, lines 10-25, which teaches grouping of slave streams), and wherein said registering is performed after it is confirmed that there is no other device than said master device and said slave device, which other device is capable of communicating with said master device and is set in a registration mode (see Koval et al, col. 7, lines 5-10, which teaches the synchronization manager determining any available slaves).

Koval et al teaches all the limitations of claims 23, 32, 33, 41, and 42, except for a priority to be used for solving conflict of data, thereby registering the slave device as a member of the data synchronization group to which the master device belongs and performing data synchronization between the first slave device and the second slave device based on the priority if the first slave device.

The general concept of a priority to be used for solving conflict of data, thereby registering the slave device as a member of the data synchronization group to which the master device belongs and performing data synchronization between the first slave device (see Kainulainen et al, col. 9, lines 40-45, which teaches synchronization based on a priority list) and the second slave device based on the priority (see Kainulainen et al, col. 9, lines 38-45, which teaches that each of the plurality of nodes has independent synchronization capabilities that is done based off of highest signal priority) is well known in the art as illustrated by Kainulainen et al.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to combine Koval et al with the general concept of wherein the information requested comprises at least one hardware characteristic of each of said one or more network workstations, as illustrated by Kainulainen et al, in order to effectively implement a server-free sync system.

With respect to claims 24, Koval et al teaches a receiver configured to receive, from a master device for a data synchronization group, a certificate indicating that the slave device belongs to a data synchronization group to which the master device belongs (see Koval et al, col. 10, lines 2-10 & 15-22, which teaches a “sync group” that allows the slave in sync with the master node to be paired in the same synchronization group upon notification), a certification unit configured to determine, when a synchronization request from another device is received, whether or not the another device and the slave device belong to the same data synchronization group by using the certificate stored in the memory (see Koval et al, col. 10, lines 10-25, which teaches grouping slave streams), a synchronization unit configured to perform data

synchronization between the another device and the slave device based on the priority stored in the memory when the certification unit determines that the another device and the slave device belong to the same data synchronization group (see Koval et al, col. 10, lines 10-25, which teaches grouping of slave streams), and wherein another device comprises one of another master device and one or more slave devices (see Koval et al, col. 2, lines 20-25, "master/slave relationship").

Koval et al teaches all the limitations of claims 24, except for a priority to be used for solving conflict of data, thereby registering the slave device as a member of the data synchronization group to which the master device belongs and performing data synchronization between the first slave device and the second slave device based on the priority if the first slave device and a memory configured to store the received certificate and priority.

The general concept of a priority to be used for solving conflict of data, thereby registering the slave device as a member of the data synchronization group to which the master device belongs and performing data synchronization between the first slave device (see Kainulainen et al, col. 9, lines 40-45, which teaches synchronization based on a priority list), the second slave device based on the priority (see Kainulainen et al, col. 9, lines 38-45, which teaches that each of the plurality of nodes has independent synchronization capabilities that is done based off of highest signal priority), and a memory configured to store the received certificate and priority (see Kainulainen et al, col. 8, lines 34-39, which teaches memory to store the synchronization priority information) is well known in the art as illustrated by Kainulainen et al.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to combine Koval et al with the general concept of wherein the information requested comprises at least one hardware characteristic of each of said one or more network workstations, as illustrated by Kainulainen et al, in order to effectively implement a server-free sync system.

With respect to claims 25, 34, and 43, Koval et al teaches transmitting from a master device to a slave device a certificate indicating that the slave device belongs to a data synchronization group to which the master device belongs (see Koval et al, col. 10, lines 2-10 & 15-22, which teaches a "sync group" that allows the slave in sync with the master node to be paired in the same synchronization group upon notification), determining whether or not a first slave device and a second slave device which is capable of communicating with the first slave device belong to the same data synchronization group by using the certificate (see Koval et al, col. 10, lines 10-25, which teaches grouping slave streams), the second slave device belonging to the same data synchronization group (see Koval et al col. 10, lines 10-25, which teaches grouping of slave streams), and wherein said master device and slave device store plural types of data and belong to plural data synchronization groups defined for each of said plural types of data (see col. 5, lines 18-23, which teaches streaming data of predefined data types).

Koval et al teaches all the limitations of claims 25, 34, and 43, except for a priority to be used for solving conflict of data, thereby registering the slave device as a member of the data synchronization group to which the master device belongs and performing data synchronization between the first slave device and the second slave device based on the priority if the first slave device.

The general concept of a priority to be used for solving conflict of data, thereby registering the slave device as a member of the data synchronization group to which the master device belongs and performing data synchronization between the first slave device (see Kainulainen et al, col. 9, lines 40-45, which teaches synchronization based on a priority list) and the second slave device based on the priority (see Kainulainen et al, col. 9, lines 38-45, which teaches that each of the plurality of nodes has independent synchronization capabilities that is done based off of highest signal priority) is well known in the art as illustrated by Kainulainen et al.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to combine Koval et al with the general concept of wherein the information requested comprises at least one hardware characteristic of each of said one or more network workstations, as illustrated by Kainulainen et al, in order to effectively implement a server-free sync system.

4. Claims 26, 35, and 44 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Koval et al (US 5,333,299) in view of Kainulainen et al (US 6,262,996), further in view of Delagi et al (US 4,016,541).

With respect to claims 26, 35, and 44, Koval et al teaches transmitting from a master device to a slave device a certificate indicating that the slave device belongs to a data synchronization group to which the master device belongs (see Koval et al, col. 10, lines 2-10 & 15-22, which teaches a "sync group" that allows the slave in sync with the master node to be paired in the same synchronization group upon notification), determining whether or not a first slave device and a second slave device which is capable of communicating with the first slave

device belong to the same data synchronization group by using the certificate (see Koval et al, col. 10, lines 10-25, which teaches grouping slave streams), the second slave device belonging to the same data synchronization group (see Koval et al, col. 10, lines 10-25, which teaches grouping of slave streams), and wherein said master device and slave device store plural types of data and belong to plural data synchronization groups defined for each of said plural types of data (see Koval et al, col. 5, lines 18-23, which teaches streaming data of predefined data types).

Koval et al teaches all the limitations of claims 26, 35, and 44, except for a priority to be used for solving conflict of data, thereby registering the slave device as a member of the data synchronization group to which the master device belongs and performing data synchronization between the first slave device and the second slave device based on the priority if the first slave device.

The general concept of a priority to be used for solving conflict of data, thereby registering the slave device as a member of the data synchronization group to which the master device belongs and performing data synchronization between the first slave device (see Kainulainen et al, col. 9, lines 40-45, which teaches synchronization based on a priority list) and the second slave device based on the priority (see Kainulainen et al, col. 9, lines 38-45, which teaches that each of the plurality of nodes has independent synchronization capabilities that is done based off of highest signal priority) is well known in the art as illustrated by Kainulainen et al.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to combine Koval et al with the general concept of wherein the information requested comprises at least one hardware

characteristic of each of said one or more network workstations, as illustrated by Kainulainen et al, in order to effectively implement a server-free sync system.

Koval et al, in combination with Kainulainen et al, teach all the limitations of claims 26, 35, and 44, except for wherein said registering is performed by transmitting said certificate and said priority from the master device belonging to a given synchronization group defined for a given type of data to the slave device belonging to the given synchronization group, said certificate and said priority being set depending on the given type of data.

The general concept of wherein said registering is performed by transmitting said certificate and said priority from the master device belonging to a given synchronization group defined for a given type of data to the slave device belonging to the given synchronization group (see Delagi et al, col. 5, lines 60-67 & col. 6, lines 5-25, which teaches that priority is awarded, based on type of request, using a master synchronizing signal to a slave synchronizing unit) , said certificate and said priority being set depending on the given type of data (see Delagi et al, col. 5, lines 60-67, which teaches that priority is issued based on the type of request) is well known in the art as illustrated by Delagi et al.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to combine Koval et al and Kainulainen et al with the general concept of wherein said registering is performed by transmitting said certificate and said priority from the master device belonging to a given synchronization group defined for a given type of data to the slave device belonging to the given synchronization group, said certificate and said priority being set depending on the given type of data, as illustrated by Delagi et al, in order to effectively implement a master-slave sync system.

5. Claims 27, 28, 36, 37, 45, and 46 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Koval et al (US 5,333,299) in view of Kainulainen et al (US 6,262,996), further in view of Chong et al (US 5,790,791).

With respect to claims 27, 36, and 45, Koval et al teaches transmitting from a master device to a slave device a certificate indicating that the slave device belongs to a data synchronization group to which the master device belongs (see Koval et al, col. 10, lines 2-10 & 15-22, which teaches a "sync group" that allows the slave in sync with the master node to be paired in the same synchronization group upon notification), determining whether or not a first slave device and a second slave device which is capable of communicating with the first slave device belong to the same data synchronization group by using the certificate (see Koval et al, col. 10, lines 10-25, which teaches grouping slave streams), the second slave device belonging to the same data synchronization group (see Koval et al, col. 10, lines 10-25, which teaches grouping of slave streams), and wherein said registering is performed after it is confirmed that there is no other device than said master device and said slave device, which other device is capable of communicating with said master device and is set in a registration mode (see Koval et al, col. 7, lines 5-10, which teaches the synchronization manager determining any available slaves).

Koval et al teaches all the limitations of claims 27, 36, and 45, except for a priority to be used for solving conflict of data, thereby registering the slave device as a member of the data synchronization group to which the master device belongs and performing data synchronization between the first slave device and the second slave device based on the priority if the first slave device.

The general concept of a priority to be used for solving conflict of data, thereby registering the slave device as a member of the data synchronization group to which the master device belongs and performing data synchronization between the first slave device (see Kainulainen et al, col. 9, lines 40-45, which teaches synchronization based on a priority list) and the second slave device based on the priority (see Kainulainen et al, col. 9, lines 38-45, which teaches that each of the plurality of nodes has independent synchronization capabilities that is done based off of highest signal priority) is well known in the art as illustrated by Kainulainen et al.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to combine Koval et al with the general concept of wherein the information requested comprises at least one hardware characteristic of each of said one or more network workstations, as illustrated by Kainulainen et al, in order to effectively implement a server-free sync system.

Koval et al, in combination with Kainulainen et al, teach all the limitations of claims 27, 36, and 45, except for transmitting data required to operate as the master device from said master device to a slave device which is targeted to transfer a master privilege, thereby transferring the master privilege to the slave device.

The general concept of transmitting data required to operate as the master device from said master device to a slave device which is targeted to transfer a master privilege, thereby transferring the master privilege to the slave device (see Chong et al, col. 2, lines 29-31 and 50-60, which teaches transfer of control from the master unit in the master/slave embodiment) is well known in the art as illustrated by Chong et al.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to combine Koval et al and Kainulainen et al with the general concept of transmitting data required to operate as the master device from said master device to a slave device which is targeted to transfer a master privilege, thereby transferring the master privilege to the slave device, as illustrated by Chong et al, in order to effectively implement a data sync system.

With respect to claims 28, 37, and 46, Koval et al teaches transmitting from a master device to a slave device a certificate indicating that the slave device belongs to a data synchronization group to which the master device belongs (see Koval et al, col. 10, lines 2-10 & 15-22, which teaches a "sync group" that allows the slave in sync with the master node to be paired in the same synchronization group upon notification), determining whether or not a first slave device and a second slave device which is capable of communicating with the first slave device belong to the same data synchronization group by using the certificate (see Koval et al, col. 10, lines 10-25, which teaches grouping slave streams), the second slave device belonging to the same data synchronization group (see Koval et al, col. 10, lines 10-25, which teaches grouping of slave streams), and wherein said registering is performed after it is confirmed that there is no other device than said master device and said slave device, which other device is capable of communicating with said master device and is set in a registration mode (see Koval et al, col. 7, lines 5-10, which teaches the synchronization manager determining any available slaves).

Koval et al teaches all the limitations of claims 28, 37, and 46, except for a priority to be used for solving conflict of data, thereby registering the slave device as a member of the data

synchronization group to which the master device belongs and performing data synchronization between the first slave device and the second slave device based on the priority if the first slave device.

The general concept of a priority to be used for solving conflict of data, thereby registering the slave device as a member of the data synchronization group to which the master device belongs and performing data synchronization between the first slave device (see Kainulainen et al, col. 9, lines 40-45, which teaches synchronization based on a priority list) and the second slave device based on the priority (see Kainulainen et al, col. 9, lines 38-45, which teaches that each of the plurality of nodes has independent synchronization capabilities that is done based off of highest signal priority) is well known in the art as illustrated by Kainulainen et al.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to combine Koval et al with the general concept of wherein the information requested comprises at least one hardware characteristic of each of said one or more network workstations, as illustrated by Kainulainen et al, in order to effectively implement a server-free sync system.

Koval et al, in combination with Kainulainen et al, teach all the limitations of claims 28, 37, and 46, except for transmitting data required to operate as the master device from said master device to a slave device which is targeted to transfer a master privilege, thereby transferring the master privilege to the slave device and wherein said master privilege transferring is performed after it is confirmed that there is no other slave device than said master device and said slave device, which other slave device is capable of communicating with said master device and is set in a master privilege transfer mode.

The general concept of transmitting data required to operate as the master device from said master device to a slave device which is targeted to transfer a master privilege, thereby transferring the master privilege to the slave device (see Chong et al, col. 2, lines 29-31 and 50-60, which teaches transfer of control from the master unit in the master/slave embodiment) and wherein said master privilege transferring is performed (see Chong et al, col. 2, lines 50-60, which teaches transfer of control from the master unit) after it is confirmed that there is no other slave device than said master device and said slave device, which other slave device is capable of communicating with said master device and is set in a master privilege transfer mode(see Chong et al, col. 2, lines 29-31, "master/slave determination") is well known in the art as illustrated by Chong et al.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to combine Koval et al and Kainulainen et al with the general concept of transmitting data required to operate as the master device from said master device to a slave device which is targeted to transfer a master privilege, thereby transferring the master privilege to the slave device and wherein said master privilege transferring is performed after it is confirmed that there is no other slave device than said master device and said slave device, which other slave device is capable of communicating with said master device and is set in a master privilege transfer mode, as illustrated by Chong et al, in order to effectively implement a data sync system.

With respect to claims 29, 38, and 47, Koval et al teaches transmitting from a master device to a slave device a certificate indicating that the slave device belongs to a data synchronization group to which the master device belongs (see Koval et al, col. 10, lines 2-10 &

15-22, which teaches a "sync group" that allows the slave in sync with the master node to be paired in the same synchronization group upon notification), determining whether or not a first slave device and a second slave device which is capable of communicating with the first slave device belong to the same data synchronization group by using the certificate (see Koval et al, col. 10, lines 10-25, which teaches grouping slave streams), and the second slave device belonging to the same data synchronization group (see Koval et al, col. 10, lines 10-25, which teaches grouping of slave streams), and slave devices that belong to the same sync group (see Koval et al, col. 10, lines 10-25, which teaches grouping).

Koval et al teaches all the limitations of claims 29, 38, and 47, except for a priority to be used for solving conflict of data, thereby registering the slave device as a member of the data synchronization group to which the master device belongs, performing data synchronization between the first slave device and the second slave device based on the priority if the first slave device, and exchanging priority between slave devices.

The general concept of a priority to be used for solving conflict of data, thereby registering the slave device as a member of the data synchronization group to which the master device belongs and performing data synchronization between the first slave device (see Kainulainen et al, col. 9, lines 40-45, which teaches synchronization based on a priority list) and the second slave device based on the priority (see Kainulainen et al, col. 9, lines 38-45, which teaches that each of the plurality of nodes has independent synchronization capabilities that is done based off of highest signal priority), and exchanging priority between slave devices (see Kainulainen et al, col. 2, lines 50-60, which teaches transferring synchronization messages of priority of the node signals) is well known in the art as illustrated by Kainulainen et al.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to combine Koval et al with the general concept of wherein the information requested comprises at least one hardware characteristic of each of said one or more network workstations, as illustrated by Kainulainen et al, in order to effectively implement a server-free sync system.

6. Claims 30, 39, and 48 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Koval et al (US 5,333,299) in view of Kainulainen et al (US 6,262,996) and Chong et al (US 5,790,791), further in view of Arita et al (US 4,727,539).

With respect to claims 30, 39, and 48, Koval et al teaches transmitting from a master device to a slave device a certificate indicating that the slave device belongs to a data synchronization group to which the master device belongs (see col. 10, lines 2-10 & 15-22, which teaches a "sync group" that allows the slave in sync with the master node to be paired in the same synchronization group upon notification), determining whether or not a first slave device and a second slave device which is capable of communicating with the first slave device belong to the same data synchronization group by using the certificate (see col. 10, lines 10-25, which teaches grouping slave streams), the second slave device belonging to the same data synchronization group (see col. 10, lines 10-25, which teaches grouping of slave streams), and wherein said registering is performed after it is confirmed that there is no other device than said master device and said slave device, which other device is capable of communicating with said master device and is set in a registration mode (see col. 7, lines 5-10, which teaches the synchronization manager determining any available slaves).

Koval et al teaches all the limitations of claims 30, 39, and 48, except for a priority to be used for solving conflict of data, thereby registering the slave device as a member of the data synchronization group to which the master device belongs, performing data synchronization between the first slave device and the second slave device based on the priority if the first slave device, and wherein said priority exchanging is performed after it is confirmed that there is no other slave device than said master device and said slave device, which other slave device is capable of communicating with said master device and is set in a priority exchanging mode.

The general concept of a priority to be used for solving conflict of data, thereby registering the slave device as a member of the data synchronization group to which the master device belongs and performing data synchronization between the first slave device (see Kainulainen et al, col. 9, lines 40-45, which teaches synchronization based on a priority list) and the second slave device based on the priority (see Kainulainen et al, col. 9, lines 38-45, which teaches that each of the plurality of nodes has independent synchronization capabilities that is done based off of highest signal priority), and exchanging priority between slave devices (see Kainulainen et al, col. 2, lines 50-60, which teaches transferring synchronization messages of priority of the node signals) is well known in the art as illustrated by Kainulainen et al.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to combine Koval et al with the general concept of wherein the information requested comprises at least one hardware characteristic of each of said one or more network workstations, as illustrated by Kainulainen et al, in order to effectively implement a server-free sync system.

Koval et al, in combination with Kainulainen et al, teach all the limitations of claims 30, 39, and 48, except for transmitting data required to operate as the master device from said master

device to a slave device which is targeted to transfer a master privilege, thereby transferring the master privilege to the slave device and wherein said master privilege transferring is performed after it is confirmed that there is no other slave device than said master device and said slave device, which other slave device is capable of communicating with said master device and is set in a master privilege transfer mode.

The general concept of transmitting data required to operate as the master device from said master device to a slave device which is targeted to transfer a master privilege, thereby transferring the master privilege to the slave device (see Chong et al, col. 2, lines 29-31 and 50-60, which teaches transfer of control from the master unit in the master/slave embodiment) and wherein said master privilege transferring is performed (see Chong et al, col. 2, lines 50-60, which teaches transfer of control from the master unit) after it is confirmed that there is no other slave device than said master device and said slave device, which other slave device is capable of communicating with said master device and is set in a master privilege transfer mode(see Chong et al, col. 2, lines 29-31, "master/slave determination") is well known in the art as illustrated by Chong et al.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to combine Koval et al and Kainulainen et al with the general concept of transmitting data required to operate as the master device from said master device to a slave device which is targeted to transfer a master privilege, thereby transferring the master privilege to the slave device and wherein said master privilege transferring is performed after it is confirmed that there is no other slave device than said master device and said slave device, which other slave device is capable of communicating with said

master device and is set in a master privilege transfer mode, as illustrated by Chong et al, in order to effectively implement a data sync system.

Koval et al, in combination with Kainulainen et al and Chong et al, teach all the limitations of claims 30, 39, and 48, except for a priority exchanging mode.

The general concept of a priority exchanging mode (see Arita et al, col. 13, lines 1-5, "changing priority") is well known in the art as illustrated by Arita et al.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to combine Koval et al, Chong et al, and Kainulainen et al with the general concept of a priority exchanging mode, as illustrated by Arita et al, in order to effectively implement an element transmission system.

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Randy A. Scott whose telephone number is (571) 272-3797. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Thursday 7:30 am-5:00 pm, second Fridays 7:30 am-4pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Ario Etienne can be reached on (571) 272-4001. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished

applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/R. S./

Examiner, Art Unit 2453

20090110

/THUHA T. NGUYEN/

Primary Examiner, Art Unit 2453